

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants note that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) has failed to examine claims 61-67, which were introduced (along with claim 60) in the response submitted on March 19, 2008. Applicants have reviewed the version of the response available on PAIR, and the prior response does contain all of claims 54-67. Because the PTO failed to consider claims 61-67, applicants submit that the office action dated June 25, 2008, is deficient in this regard.

Claims 54 and 61 have been amended with this response to include the limitations of claims 60 and 67, respectively, and the latter claims have been cancelled. The PTO acknowledged at page 7 of the outstanding office action that claim 60 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Claims 54-59 and 61-66 are pending.

In view of the above amendments, applicants submit that the rejection of claims 54, 58, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by WO 95/03426 to Cleuziat et al. (“Cleuziat”), with reference to U.S. Patent No. 5,849,547 to Cleuziat et al., and the rejection of claims 55-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Cleuziat in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,972,618 to Bloch are overcome and should be withdrawn.

Because claims 54-59 as presented are allowable over the art of record, applicants submit that claims 61-66 also are allowable.

In view of all of the foregoing, applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2008

/Edwin V. Merkel/

Edwin V. Merkel

Registration No. 40,087

NIXON PEABODY LLP
1100 Clinton Square
Rochester, New York 14604-1792
Telephone: (585) 263-1128
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600